

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated March 24, 2005, claims 1, 10, 16, and 21 have been amended and claim 11 has been canceled. Claims 1-10 and 12-26 are in the case. The Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the present application.

Record is made of a telephonic phone call by Applicants' attorney Edmond A. DeFrank to Examiner K. Lim. The March 24, 2005 Office Action and the claims were mentioned. The Applicants' attorney mentioned modifying the independent claims to overcome the rejections under 35 USC § 102. Thus, the below response reflects the amendments proposed by the Applicants' attorney.

The Office Action objected to claim 11 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Since claim 11 has been canceled for other reasons, the objection is moot.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-26 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by McCanne et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,872).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Namely, McCanne et al. fail to disclose all of the Applicants' newly claimed elements. In particular, McCanne et al. fail to disclose the Applicants' claimed "...using a fixed filter system to analyze the registered streams of interest of adjacent routers and to create a reservation for each stream of interest as a thread based on bandwidth..." and "...responding to homogeneous requests simultaneously if more than one reservation from various hosts for a same interest thread is made..." As disclosed in FIG. 4 of the Applicants' disclosure, in the Internet Group Management Protocol (IGMP) format, there is a 64 bit header with two 32 bit parts. One of 32 bit parts corresponds to the IP multicast group ID 234. The other 32 bit part corresponds to 4 bit IGMP version, a 4 bit IGMP type, a 16 bit checksum and an unused 8 bit portion. Referring to FIG. 4, this unused portion can carry the identifier representing the interest thread. In other words, the unused portion is available to register interest threads 1-n, 440.

Further, as shown in FIG. 4, the register system 190 is part of the IP layer 240, and this layer also includes a filter system 460. Based on the adjacent routers/hosts registered

streams of interest, the filter system 460 forwards only relevant data. For example, if a particular adjacent router is interested in streams 1 (text) and 3 (audio) out of possible streams 1-4 (text, images, audio, video), it only forwards streams 1 and 3. The filter system 460 may be a fixed filter style in that one reservation is created for each interest thread 1-n 440 specified. This reservation, which is based on bandwidth, is used to send data efficiently with the filter system. If the system has a number of reservations from various hosts for the same interest thread the system will be able to respond to that homogeneous group simultaneously.

In contrast, McCanne et al. disclose an "...overlay protocol and system for allowing multicast routing in the Internet to be performed at the application level. The overlay protocol uses "native" Internet multicast and multicast routing protocols to route information, according to overlay routing tables. Overlay groups are mapped to native multicast groups to exploit native multicasting in regional or local forwarding domains. Use of the overlay protocol allows overlay distribution to be handled in a...bandwidth-managed fashion." (see Abstract and FIG. 1 of McCanne et al.) and not the Applicants' using a fixed filter system to analyze the registered streams of interest of adjacent routers and to create a reservation for each stream of interest as a thread based on bandwidth and responding to homogeneous requests simultaneously if more than one reservation from various hosts for a same interest thread is made.

As such, since McCanne et al. fail to disclose all of the elements of the Applicants' newly amended claims, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is overcome. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Further, with regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (MPEP § 2143.03). Also, the other prior art references cited by the Examiner also have been considered by the Applicants in requesting allowance of the dependant claims and none have been found to teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention.

In view of the arguments and amendments set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the subject application are in immediate condition for allowance. Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully

requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, the Applicants kindly request the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney at (818) 885-1575 if it would further the prosecution of the subject application or if an Examiner's amendment would further the prosecution of the subject application.

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: June 23, 2005



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicants
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX